

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of August 31, 2007, has been carefully reviewed; these remarks are responsive thereto.

The paragraph of the specification beginning at page 3, line 1, as amended by preliminary amendment filed 14 September 2005, contained two typographical errors which are corrected by this amendment. By this amendment, the independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 21 have been amended, for example, to recite “a packet traffic filter for filtering packet traffic.” The filter/function/module are shown in each of Figures 2 and 3 as a component of access point 130<sub>n</sub>. Please refer to packet filter module 330 and packet filter module 420. The filtering is first discussed in the Abstract (PCT/US2004/007806) and also respectively at page 6, second paragraph, lines 12-28; at page 7, lines 3 through page 8, line 1. An advantage is specially discussed at page 7, line 13-18 of “filtering traffic 330 associated with an HTTP access request from the client terminal for access to the wireless network redirecting the HTTP to a designated web server 120, and issuing a request from the designated web server to the client terminal 140<sub>n</sub>” of WLAN 115.

Claim 22 has been added as a new claim to recite features “creating a plurality of operational states, said packet traffic filter receiving wireless local area network state information from said access point”. Claim 23 has been added as a new claim to recite features “the access point creating a plurality of operational states wherein said packet traffic filter means receives wireless local area network state information from said access point.” These features are not found in the prior art of record, either cited or applied, at least on the grounds that no packet filter is found in any of the applied references cited in corresponding applications in other countries. See support for the recitation at page 6, ll.

12-28. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Thus, claims 1-23 are pending, following entry of this amendment, and urged to be in condition for allowance.

### **Rejection of the Claims**

In the Office Action, the original claims, as amended by preliminary amendment of 14 September 2005, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Luo, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0169713 (hereinafter Luo). It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended herein patentably distinguish over Luo, and also over prior art cited during Chinese prosecution of the present application, to Anton et al., WO 02/11391A2, published 7 February 2002. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested. It is also important to note that the Mexican Patent Office has rejected similar claims based on US 2002/0176366 to Ayyagari et al., which the US Examiner has cited as relevant but was not applied. The Applicants have reviewed all of these references for a discussion of a packet filter substantially as claimed. No suggestion or disclosure has been found.

The Examiner points to Luo [0037] for an access request and [0039; 0040 and 0042] for “redirecting the access request . . .” Applicants have reviewed these paragraphs of Luo and find that paragraphs [0037], [0039], [0040] and [0042] fail to teach or suggest a packet traffic filter as recited.

Luo teaches a mobility access point (MAP) 102 of which there are several dispersed within a “large-scale WLAN network 100” per, for example, Figure 1. In a Mobile State Table (118), a plurality of states are maintained such as a routing state and an associating state (see

[0023] and [0024] for details). A given mobile host (MH) 106 is automatically assigned a MAP 102 as its home agent. If it moves, the MH is assigned a new MAP 102. A “home agent controller 116” is responsible “for monitoring and/or adjusting the traffic load on every home agent” ([0029]). A “home agent controller” per Figure 1 connectable via a “backhaul” is not a “packet traffic filter” as recited. For example, *arguendo*, if the home traffic controller comprises a filter function, that function does not reside in the recited method or access point of the present invention. Consequently, Luo teaches away from the claims as presently amended, for example, to teach an access point redirecting via a packet traffic filter. Since Luo teaches away from the independent claims as presently amended, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21 are respectfully requested. Similarly, the art cited in corresponding applications in other countries fails to teach a packet traffic filter as recited.

According to new claims 22 and 23, and according to one embodiment with reference to Figure 2, an access point 130<sub>n</sub> is utilized “to create several operational states” (page 6, ll. 17-18). Again, Luo is limited to only certain operational states specifically identified at paragraphs [0023] and [0024] per mobile state table 118. Moreover, Luo does not teach or suggest providing state information to a packet filtering function. To the contrary, “The packet filter module 330 (Figure 2) is responsible for filtering packets based on the criteria set by other modules” (of the system); see p. 6, ll. 26-28.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance of claims 1-23, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 609-734-6832.

Respectfully submitted,

Junbiao Zhang, et al

By: 

Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney  
Registration No. 22,856  
(609) 734-6832

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

Date: 16 Jan '08